

System Configuration Team (SCT)

Reasonable & Prudent Measure #26

Meeting Notes

March 20, 2002

Greetings and Introductions.

The March 20 meeting of the System Configuration Team was held at the National Marine Fisheries Service offices in Portland, Oregon. The meeting was chaired by Bill Hevlin of NMFS and facilitated by Donna Silverberg. The agenda and a list of attendees for the meeting are attached as Enclosures A and B. Hevlin read a round of introductions, a review of the agenda and the notes from the February 21 SCT meeting.

The following is a distillation (not a verbatim transcript) of items discussed at the meeting, together with actions taken on those items. Please note that some enclosures referenced may be too lengthy to routinely include with the meeting notes; copies of all enclosures referred to in the minutes are available upon request from Kathy Ceballos of NMFS at 503/230-5420.

2. Continued Discussion of FY-02 CRFM Program.

John Kranda distributed a revised version of the CRFM measures worksheet (attached as Enclosure C); he noted that the FY-02 line-items shown in white have changed since last meeting, while shaded items have not changed. Kranda then spent a few minutes going through some of the most significant changes to the cost estimates associated with these line-items; the group asked a variety of clarifying questions.

The bottom line, said Kranda, is that we're at about \$76 million for the FY-02 CRFM program, down about \$5 million since the beginning of the year. We're currently looking for \$8.4 million in reprogramming; we sent a letter to that effect to the Corps chain of command earlier this week, letting them know that we need the first of those additional funding increments by mid-April, Kranda said. I am assuming with cautious confidence that those funds will be restored, said Kranda. So getting savings and slippage restored is more or less a done deal? asked Ron Boyce. Every indication is that those funds will be

restored, Kranda replied.

In response to an issue discussed at the February SCT meeting, Hevlin also noted that he hoped to reach a decision at today's meeting about the new Bonneville high-flow PIT detection proposal. Rock Peters noted that the initial phase of this project would be to attempt to establish the level of detection that could be expected from this technology; the region would then make a decision about whether or not construction should proceed. As you're aware, said Peters, we simply don't have a good data set for the sluiceway at this time; this project is an attempt to get at that information.

The cost for FY-02 would be \$300,000, Hevlin said; it sounds as though that money is available. To me, he said, the pro would be additional PIT-tag information on juveniles passing through the Bonneville corner collector; that would benefit all of our passage survival studies. The group devoted a few minutes of discussion to the potential pros and cons of the High-Q PIT project; Rod Woodin reiterated his concern that this \$300,000 feasibility assessment could lead to a more protracted commitment of funds. Hevlin said that, again, there is no commitment of funds beyond the initial \$300,000. Ultimately, the SCT agreed to recommend funding for the FY-02 high-Q PIT feasibility analysis; it was further agreed that the salmon managers will provide any comments they may have about the appropriate scope of this project to the Corps. In response to a question from Boyce, Peters said the contract for this project will need to be awarded almost immediately, so any comments will need to be provided to him by next week.

3. FY-03 CRFM Program Prioritization.

A. New Adjustments to the FY-03 Program. Continuing on through the revised spreadsheet, Kranda reviewed recent changes to the cost of FY-03 line-items. He noted that the FY-03 items that have changed are highlighted in grey, while the line-items that are unchanged are not shaded. Kranda said most of these items were changed because the Corps has received more accurate cost estimates, where previously, many of these estimates were simply placeholders, initially. Kranda and Mike Mason spent a few minutes going through some of the specific changes to the cost estimates associated with various FY-03 line-items; the group offered a variety of clarifying questions and comments.

Kranda noted that the Presidential recommendation for the FY-03 CRFM budget is \$98 million; the high-priority items in the current CRFM spreadsheet total \$97 million. There are another \$9 million in medium-priority line-items, Kranda added, which would bring the total to \$106 million. That's a good segue into the next agenda item, Hevlin said.

B. Review of Medium-Priority, New and Not-Funded Items. Hevlin distributed Enclosure D, ARecommendations from the 3/12/02 Subcommittee Meeting.@ He noted that, in addition to him, the subcommittee's participants included Rod Woodin and Shane Scott of WDFW, Boyce, Steve Pettit of IDFG, Tom Lorz of CRITFC and Kim Fodrea of Bonneville. Hevlin said the overall intent of the subcommittee meeting was to identify medium-priority, new and non-funded line-items which should be considered for high-

priority status in FY-03, as well as any high-priority items that should receive a lower priority in order to free up funding.

Hevlin spent a few minutes going through the subcommittee's specific recommendations, including the medium-priority line-items the subcommittee feels deserve high-priority status (Line-items 47, 50, 53, 55, 56, 58, 64, 70, 76, 82), as well as medium-priority items which require further information (Line-items 62, 75), and the prioritization of the various FY-03 spillway efficiency/survival studies. The subcommittee's recommendations are captured in Enclosure D; please refer to this document for more detailed information. The SCT devoted a few minutes of discussion to this document, ensuring that it is an accurate reflection of what was actually agreed to at the March 12 subcommittee meeting. It was agreed to change the designation of Line-items 47, 50, 53, 55, 56, 58, 64, 70, 76 and 82 from AM to AHM; the Corps agreed to re-run the FY-03 cumulative total to include these new Ahigh-medium priorities, and give the group a sense of the total cost of the FY-03 program.

In response to a request regarding Line-Item 70, Hevlin said he and David Wills will check with Ben Meyer of the Caspian tern work group about the extent of the problem and about the specific actions that are being undertaken. In the interim, said Hevlin, we will designate this as an AHM line-item for the estuary, at least for the time being. Basically, he said, we just need some more information on this particular line-item.

Hevlin also touched briefly on the information about the prioritization of upcoming spillway efficiency/survival studies from the March 13 SRWG meeting; we don't need to make a decision about this, he said, but rather will await the SRWG's continuing work in refining these studies.

It was agreed that the Corps will produce a new version of the CRFM measures worksheet reflecting the new AHM priorities agreed to at today's meeting in time for discussion at the April SCT meeting.

C. Planning Schedule/Diagrams for The Dalles and Lower Monumental Illustrating Critical Paths for Alternative Juvenile Passage Improvements and Decision Points. Mason distributed Enclosure E, a revised Lower Monumental project configuration schedule for the years 2002-2006; he spent a few minutes going through its contents. Mason noted that the Corps' Lower Monumental decision analysis process is expected to be complete by the end of FY-03, with the final configuration decision due by December 31, 2003. Mason noted that flow deflector construction at Lower Monumental is nearly complete. He then touched on the schedule for the divider/outfall work, spill survival/efficiency evaluation, removable spillway weir implementation, ESBS implementation and other projects (separator, full-flow PIT detection and adult PIT) at Lower Monumental. Mason made it clear that there is no presumptive path, at this point, about which of these measures will ultimately be implemented at Lower Monumental; those decisions will be laid out in the Corps' Lower Monumental final configuration decision late next year.

The group also discussed the proposal to install pan inserts in the gatewell at Lower Monumental; it was noted that these inserts would be transferred from McNary to Lower Monumental and installed at the latter project. Mason said Corps O&M has agreed to pick up the fairly minimal cost of transferring the existing gatewell inserts from McNary and installing them at Lower Monumental. After a few minutes of discussion, general SCT support was expressed for the insert project at Lower Monumental, although Woodin said he will need to discuss the proposed installation with appropriate personnel at WDFW before agreeing to support it.

Hevlin thanked Mason for what he called a good start to the Lower Monumental scheduling issue; he said the SCT will continue to provide comments as appropriate, and as the schedule is fleshed out further.

Next, the Corps= Norm Polonen distributed Enclosure F, a series of overheads containing information about The Dalles Fish Program review: percent passage by route under 40% spill, survival rates at 40% spill, relative passage survival of juvenile salmon at The Dalles spillway and ice and trash sluiceway, 1998-2000, fish passage efficiency (FPE), spill passage efficiency (SPE) and sluice passage efficiency (SLPE) for juvenile salmonid migrants at The Dalles 1999-2000, and an implementation schedule for The Dalles Fish Program FY-02-FY-07.

Polonen spent a few minutes going through his handout; please refer to Enclosure F for details. He noted that several of the items on the schedule were updated following yesterday's FFDRWG meeting. Polonen, too, said he will provide further updates to the SCT as additional information becomes available. Boyce noted that it was very helpful to have a work-session prior to today's SCT meeting; he suggested that another work session be scheduled to give various SCT participants an opportunity to have some additional discussion about the AHM@ projects; it was agreed, however, to defer the subcommittee meeting until after the April 25 SCT meeting.

4. Updates.

A. February Portland District FFDRWG, March 13 SRWG Meeting. Peters distributed written updates from the most recent SRWG and FFDRWG meetings; he asked the SCT to review these summaries at their leisure and discuss any issues or concerns they may have directly with him. In general, said Peters, everything is moving forward, from a study standpoint; things are quite hectic right now. Peters said anyone with any disagreements about the McNary turbine survival study or other studies should contact him directly, as soon as possible B it's the 12th hour, not just the 11th, he said.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is now back on the Internet; we once again have access to the email system, David Wills announced.

B. Status of New Deflectors at Bonneville and McNary. This agenda item was not discussed at today's meeting.

C. Status of Spring Studies. Hevlin noted that he had received the operational plan for the Lower Granite RSW study from Tim Wick, including the schedule for when various operations are going to occur. He said he will forward the plan to the other SCT members.

5. Next SCT Meeting Date.

The next meeting of the System Configuration Team was set for April 25. Meeting summary prepared by Jeff Kuechle, BPA contractor.